

**REMARKS**

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Andrew L. Nalven, dated 2 Feb 2005.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, and 14-19 are in the case. Claims 15-19 have been allowed, and claims 6-8, 11, and 14 objected to but deemed allowable.

***Claim Objections***

Applicants have corrected the designation of claim 18.

LOT920000012US1

16

S/N 09/596,282

**35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1-5, 9-10, and 12-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over McGee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,694,434, hereinafter McGee) in view of Samar et al (U.S. Patent 6,304,974, hereinafter Samar).

Applicants have canceled claims 9-10 and 12-13 without prejudice, and have amended claims 1-4 (and thereby, claim 5 which depends from claim 4) to recite the group list storing the union of names of signatories or users authorized to execute agents referenced by applications downloadable from a plurality of servers.

McGee provides a way of augmenting verification of signatures, and relates to the use of hash values, or secondary identifiers, for determining if a program is allowed to run.

Samar relates to the distribution of trusted certifiers through the use of check signatures, or hash marks. That is, Samar teaches how to use finger prints to get lists of certifiers.

LOT920000012US1

17

S/N 09/596,282

In both McGee and Samar, the pki signature system of trusted code is augmented. In McGee, signature verification is provided, and in Samar the distribution of trusted signatures is provided.

As the Examiner observes (Office Action, page 5), neither McGee nor Samar teaches a group list store storing the union of names of signatories authorized to execute agents referenced by applications downloadable from a plurality of servers.

Applicants urge that claims 1-5 be allowed.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 6-8, 11, and 14 have been objected to as depending from rejected base claims, but otherwise allowable. Claims 15-19 have been allowed.

Applicants have amended claim 4 to include the limitations of claim 6, which has now been canceled, and have amended claims 11, and 14 so as included the limitations of their respective base and intervening claims.

LOT920000012US1

18

S/N 09/596,282

Claims 7 and 8 now depend from base claim 4 which has been amended as previously noted.

Applicants urge that claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, and 14 now be allowed.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, and 14-19 .

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in

LOT920000012US1

19


S/N 09/596,282

condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

C. J. Kraenzel, et al.

By

  
Shelley M Beckstrand  
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 2 April 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.  
Patent Attorney

61 Glenmont Road  
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972  
Fax: (276) 238-1545

LOT920000012US1

20

S/N 09/596,282